



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

statesmen, educators, philosophers, theologians, literary men, soldiers, business-men, liberal thinkers, and others. The editor has arranged these excerpts alphabetically (by authors) under nine heads: God, creation, the Bible, Christ, immortality, the millennium, the intermediate state, and the resurrection. The very laudable purpose of the book, as set forth in the preface, is twofold: (1) to let these great men, often misquoted and misunderstood, speak for themselves; and (2) to bring about a spirit of toleration on the part of leaders in the church. Should the book accomplish this object, even to a small extent, it would seem that the compiler's work had not been in vain. There are, of course, limitations and defects in the work, but most of these are due to the nature of the task in hand. Thus the extracts, though usually quite copious, are necessarily torn from the context in which they originally stood. Often the most orthodox things a man has written are selected, rather than the things which express his deepest and most central convictions. And, finally, the alphabetical arrangement has made a sort of encyclopædic heterogeneity not altogether conducive to consecutive reading. The volume will, no doubt, be of most value to the busy pastor who desires to have at hand an abundance of material, by the best writers, on the subjects enumerated above.

WM. R. SCHOEMAKER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE HISTORY OF THE DEVIL AND THE IDEA OF EVIL FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY. By DR. PAUL CARUS. Chicago: Open Court, 1900. Pp. xvi + 496. \$6.

THIS is a sumptuous volume. A large (almost royal) octavo, printed with wide margins on good paper, illustrated with about 300 cuts, many of them full-page, and this not counting the many beautiful half-tone green etchings at the beginning and end of sections, tastily bound in black with illustrated front cover; book and title are well suited to please the eye. The type is good, not too heavily leaded, and misprints are not numerous. Hence the reader approaches the volume almost biased in its favor.

The subject, too, is catching. Only one topic could be of profounder interest to humanity. The devil and the idea of evil—the interest is both practical and philosophical. What is the treatment Dr. Carus gives this theme?

In the main the method is historical. After a brief, partly metaphysical, introduction, the author provides a chapter on devil-worship.

He then proceeds to a review of the religions of Egypt, Accadian and Semitic Babylonia, Persia, the Hebrews, and of the historic faiths of India. Next he considers the intra-canonical writings and the Gnostic circles of ideas. Early Christian ideas concerning demons and evil, as set forth in canonical and apocryphal writings, are then reviewed, particular attention being paid to the doctrine of hell in both literature and art. The eschatology of Greece and Rome next comes in for consideration under the heading "The Idea of *Salvation* in Greece and Italy"! We find, then, a sketch of Scandinavian and Teutonic demonology with their effects upon Christianity. The chapter on "The Devil's Prime" defies summarizing, ranging from Moses' performance before Pharaoh to the modern Indian ghost dance, but is principally concerned with witchcraft. The Inquisition furnishes material for a long chapter. Two more are occupied with the devil in the literature and belief of the age of the Reformation, followed by one on the devil in verse and fable. "The Philosophic Problem," in fifty pages, with a fair index, closes the volume.

Such is the matter of the volume. What is its value? A great deal of information new to most laymen is offered. None of this is first-hand; it is drawn from sources available to all students of the subject. Yet, for those who do not know what the comparatively recent science of religion has brought together the book is serviceable. Worthy of praise is the author's industry in collecting illustrations. In fact, these tell the story more clearly than does the text. They alone are worth the price of the book.

But if, as was the case with the reviewer, the reader hopes to find traced to their origin the ideas of evil and devil, he will be disappointed. That the student of religions can now do this with close approximation is one of the fruits of the science, but it is not done here. Perhaps that was not Dr. Carus' aim; if it was, he has failed, for two reasons—lack of arrangement and introduction of irrelevant matter. For instance, whatever may be said of the Hindu trinity, what relation has the Christian Trinity to either devil or evil? Yet many pages and pictures deal with the Christian Trinity. As an example of misarrangement, take the chapter on "The Dawn of the New Era." This seems intended to deal with intra-testamental times; then why drag in Jacob Boehme centuries ahead of his times?

A blemish on the work is the author's dogmatism. Is it true that Waitz, Lubbock, and Tylor warrant the conviction that "devil-worship *naturally* precedes the worship of a benign and morally good deity?"

(p. 6)? or that "religion *always* begins with fear" (p. 14)? or that there was monotheism in Egypt and Babylonia (p. 49)? or that the Arabic gospel of the infancy is "documentary *evidence*" of the eastern origin of the Magi (p. 59)? or that "the wisdom literature shows many traces of Indian influence" (p. 147)? or that "during the first century of the development of the Christian church the ideal of a God-mother was *abandoned*" (p. 148)? Did not the Semites "rise" till long after 3000 B. C. (p. 29)?

The author's philosophy (or his English) puzzles the reviewer. What does this mean: "(God's) nature does not consist of indifferent generalities, but exhibits a distinct *suchness*. Indeed: all *suchness* in the world, in physical nature as well as in the domain of spirit, depends upon God as here defined" (p. 4)? (Italics are all ours.)

Minor blemishes are found. "Bell-Merodach" (p. 41) rings false; the horrible word "resurrected" occurs pp. 163, 247; *παρώταρσας* for *ταρταρώσας* is found p. 200; *ἀνασκοποῦν* means, not "crucify," but *impale* (p. 211). After all, the illustrations are the best part of the volume.

GEORGE W. GILMORE.

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL,
Meadville, Pa.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE: Studies in the Science of Religion. By
GEORGE A. COE. New York: Eaton & Mains, 1900. Pp
281. \$1.

THE second title to the volume represents its character better than the first. It is not a treatise or essay on the spiritual life, but a careful study of certain groups of religious phenomena from an empirical point of view. It is one of the best—certainly the most lucid and interesting—of those studies which approach the facts of religion by the methods of psychology. It stands for a distinct epoch in the study of religion—the reinforcement of philosophical and theological discussion of the problems of the spiritual life by the methods of science.

Perhaps the most valuable and original contribution in the volume is on the relation between temperament and religion. Why do certain persons experience striking religious transformations and others labor in vain for such experiences? Why do certain forms of religious expression appeal to one class of persons and not to another? What conditions underlie the different attitudes of the sexes toward the conventional religious forms? Dr. Coe's analysis is clear, and his array